

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 04-7898**

---

THOMAS EARL GREENE,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

GREENVILLE COUNTY DETENTION CENTER MEDICAL  
DEPARTMENT,

Defendant - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of  
South Carolina, at Greenville. Joseph F. Anderson, Jr., Chief  
District Judge. (CA-04-22330-6-13AK)

---

Submitted: February 24, 2005

Decided: March 9, 2005

---

Before NIEMEYER, WILLIAMS, and KING, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Thomas Earl Greene, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.  
See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Thomas Earl Greene appeals the district court's order accepting and adopting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and dismissing without prejudice his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2000) complaint for failure to state a claim and failure to exhaust administrative remedies. The district court referred this case to a magistrate judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) (2000). The magistrate judge recommended that relief be denied and advised Greene that failure to timely file specific, written objections to this recommendation could waive appellate review of a district court order based upon the recommendation. Despite this warning, Greene failed to file specific objections to the magistrate judge's recommendation. Greene's filed objections were entirely general and conclusory.

The timely filing of specific objections to a magistrate judge's recommendation is necessary to preserve appellate review of the substance of that recommendation when the parties have been warned that failure to object will waive appellate review. See Wright v. Collins, 766 F.2d 841, 845-46 (4th Cir. 1985); see also Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140 (1985). Greene has waived appellate review by failing to file objections with any specificity after receiving proper notice. Accordingly, we affirm the judgment of the district court. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the

materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED